arXiv:1405.0355v1 [cs.GT] 2 May 2014

Characterization and Detection of ϵ-Berge Zhukovskii Equilibria

Noémi Gaskó[1], Mihai Suciu[1], Rodica Ioana Lung[1], D. Dumitrescu[1]

Babeş-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca, Romania
No. 1 Mihail Kogalniceanu Street,
RO-400084 Cluj-Napoca, Romania

Abstract

Berge equilibrium in the sense of Zhukovskii (Berge-Zhukovskii) is an alternate solution concept in non-cooperative game theory that formalizes cooperation in a noncooperative setting. In this paper the ϵ-Berge-Zhukovskii equilibrium is introduced and characterized by using a generative relation. A computational method for detecting ϵ-Berge-Zhukovskii equilibrium based on evolutionary multiobjective optimization algorithms is presented. Numerical examples are used to illustrate the results obtained.

Keywords: game theory, ϵ-Berge-Zhukovskii equilibrium detection

1. Introduction

In non-cooperative game theory players make decisions independently based on their own interests and different equilibrium concepts are used to provide decision makers an overview over possible outcomes of the game. The most popular equilibrium concept is the Nash equilibrium [19] - a game situation from which no player has an incentive to unilaterally deviate. A more general equilibrium concept based on the notion of equilibrium for a partition with respect to a coalition was proposed by Berge [3]. Zhukovskii [24] formalized a particularization of the general Berge equilibrium and introduced it as an alternate solution concept that is complementary to Nash and more suited for games where the Nash equilibrium has no practical value (trust games [17], taxation games [7, 8]). In literature the equilibrium defined by Zhukovskii is referred to as Berge equilibrium in the sense of Zhukovskii [14, 20] or simply the Berge equilibrium [7, 6]. In this paper we will refer to it as the Berge-Zhukovskii equilibrium (BZ).

The Berge-Zhukovskii (BZ) equilibrium is a situation in which every player's strategy is stable against the deviations of *all* other players. Existence theorems and characterizations for BZ equilibrium can be found in [1, 20, 2, 18] and [14]. A connection between the BZ and the Nash equilibrium of several two person games that provides also a method to find the BZ in n-player games is presented in [6]. To the best of our knowledge the first computational method aimed to directly detect the Berge-Zhukovskii equilibrium is described in [12].

The ϵ-Nash equilibrium introduced by Radner [22] can be viewed as a weakening of the strict rationality - in this case it is enough to be "near" to the Nash equilibrium - or to approximate the Nash equilibrium. The value of ϵ can be interpreted in several ways: measuring an uncertainty of selecting a strategy, measuring a supplementary cost of attending the equilibrium strategy, or a perturbation of the players rationality [10].

The ϵ-Berge-Zhukovskii equilibrium is introduced in a similar manner. The intuition behind is the same as in the case of the ϵ-Nash equilibrium: the *epsilon* gives a perturbation to the players strategies.

A generative relation for a certain game equilibrium is a binary relation defined on strategy profiles with the property that the set of strategy profiles non-dominated with respect to that relation is identic with the set of that equilibria of the game (non-dominated strategies are those for which there does not exists 'better' ones with respect to the generative relation).

A generative relation for describing ϵ-Berge-Zhukovskii equilibrium is proposed. The most important feature of this relation is that it can be used to redirect the search of an evolutionary multiobjective optimization algorithm towards the ϵ-Berge-Zhukovskii equilibria of the game.

The remaining of the paper is structured as follows: after a brief introduction in non-cooperative games Section two, the Berge-Zhukovskii and ϵ-Berge-Zhukovskii equilibrium are presented. Section three introduces the generative relation used in the equilibrium detection method. Section four gives a short introduction in multiobjective optimization. In Section five numerical experiments are described. The paper ends with conclusions.

2. Berge-Zhukovskii and ϵ-Berge-Zhukovskii equilibrium

A finite strategic non-cooperative game can be formalized as a system

$$G = ((N, S_i, u_i), i = 1, ..., n),$$

where:

- N represents a set of players, and n is the number of players;
- S_i is the set of actions available to player $i \in N$,

$$S = S_1 \times S_2 \times ... \times S_n$$

is the set of all possible situations of the game, and $s = (s_1, ...s_n) \in S$ is a strategy (or strategy profile) of the game;

- for each player $i \in N$, $u_i : S \to R$ represents the payoff function of player i.

We will denote by $S_{-i} = S_1 \times ... \times S_{i-1} \times S_{i+1} \times ... \times S_n$, $s_{-i} = (s_1, ..., s_{i-1}, s_{i+1}, ..., s_n)$ and $(s_i^*, s_{-i}) = (s_1, s_2, ..., s_i^*, ..., s_n)$.

The Berge equilibrium is formally defined as follows:

Definition 1 (Berge equilibrium). *Let M be a finite set of indices. Denote by $P = \{P_t\}, t \in M$ a partition of N and $R = \{R_t\}, t \in M$ be a set of subsets of N. A strategy profile $s^* \in S$ is an equilibrium strategy for the partition P with respect to the set R, or simply a Berge equilibrium strategy, if and only if the condition*

$$u_{p_m}(s^*) \geq u_{p_m}(s_{R_m}, s^*_{N-R_m})$$

holds for each given $m \in M$, any $p_m \in P_m$ and $s_{R_m} \in S_{R_m}$.

Remark 1. *If $P = \{\{i\} : i \in N\}$ and $S = \{\{i\} : i \in N\}$ it is clear that the Nash equilibrium is a Berge equilibrium for P relative to S, so every Nash equilibrium is a Berge equilibrium. A Berge equilibrium which is also a Nash equilibrium is called Nash-Berge equilibrium [1].*

If we consider each class P_i of the partition P consists from a player i and each set of R_i is the set N of players except i, we have $M = N$, $P_i = \{i\}$ and $R_i = N - i, \forall i \in N$, we obtain the Berge-Zhukovskii equilibrium.

Playing in Berge-Zhukovskii sense means that each player wants to maximize the payoff of the other players. This equilibrium concept can be interpreted as capturing cooperation in a non-cooperative game. Formally we write:

Table 1: The payoff functions of the two players in Prisoner's Dilemma

		Player 2	
		Cooperate	Defect
Player 1	Cooperate	(2, 2)	(0, 3)
	Defect	(3, 0)	(1, 1)

Definition 2 (Berge-Zhukovskii). *A strategy profile $s^* \in S$ is a Berge-Zhukovskii equilibrium if the inequality*

$$u_i(s^*) \geq u_i(s_i^*, s_{-i})$$

holds for each player $i = 1, ..., n$, and all $s_{-i} \in S_{-i}$.

The strategy s^* is a Berge-Zhukovskii equilibrium, if the payoff of each player i does not decrease considering any deviation of the other $N - \{i\}$ players.

Example 1. *Let us consider the Prisoner's Dilemma game presented in Table 1.*

The game has one pure Nash equilibrium (Defect, Defect)*, which does not ensure the highest possible payoff for the two players. In contrary to this, the Berge-Zhukovskii equilibrium of the game is* (Cooperate, Cooperate)*, which may be a better solution for both players.*

Inspired by the notion of ϵ-Nash equilibrium, the ϵ-Berge-Zhukovskii equilibrium is introduced. The new equilibrium concept gives a flexibility to the standard Berge-Zhukovskii equilibrium.

The formal definition is the following:

Definition 3 (ϵ-Berge-Zhukovskii equilibrium). *A strategy profile $s^* \in S$ is an ϵ- Berge-Zhukovskii equilibrium if the inequality*

$$u_i(s^*) \geq u_i(s_i^*, s_{-i}) - \epsilon, \epsilon > 0$$

holds for each player $i = 1, ..., n$, and $s_{N-i} \in S_{-i}$.

Remark 2. *If $\epsilon = 0$ the ϵ-BZ is actually the Berge-Zhukovskii equilibrium.*

We denote by BZ_ϵ the set of all ϵ- Berge-Zhukovskii equilibria of the game.

3. Generative relation for ϵ-Berge-Zhukovskii equilibrium

Generative relations [15] are used to characterize a certain equilibrium. Furthermore, they may be used within optimization heuristics for fitness assignment purposes in order to guide their search to the desired equilibrium type.

The first generative relation was introduced for the Nash equilibrium detection [15]. A generative relation for the detection of Berge-Zhukovskii equilibrium is introduced in [12].

Consider two strategy profiles s and q from S. Denote by $b_\epsilon(s,q)$ the number of players who lose (with a deviation of ϵ) by remaining to the initial strategy s, while the other players are switching their strategies to q if they are all different from s.

We may express $b_\epsilon(s,q)$ as:

$$b_\epsilon(s,q) = card\{i \in N, u_i(s) < u_i(s_i, q_{-i}) + \epsilon, s_{-i} \sharp q_{-i}\},$$

where $card\{M\}$ denotes the cardinality of the set M and $s_{-i} \sharp q_{-i} \iff s_j \neq q_j$ for all $j = 1, ..., n, j \neq i$.

The intuition behind the construction of b_ϵ is that, in the search form ϵ-BZ we try to minimize the number of players whose payoff would increase when all the others switch to other strategies. Two strategy profiles may be compared by using the following relation:

Definition 4. *Let $s, q \in S$. We say the strategy s is better than strategy q (s dominates q) with respect to ϵ-Berge-Zhukovskii equilibrium, and we write $s \prec_{B_\epsilon} q$, if and only if the inequality*

$$b_\epsilon(s,q) < b_\epsilon(q,s)$$

holds, i.e. there are less players that would benefit when all the others change their strategies from s to q than from q to s.

Remark 3. *If $b_\epsilon(s,q) = b_\epsilon(q,s)$ then we consider s and q to be indifferent to each other with respect to the $\prec_{B_\epsilon}$ relation .*

Definition 5. *The strategy profile $s^* \in S$ is an ϵ-Berge-Zhukovskii non-dominated strategy (BZN_ϵ), if and only if there is no strategy $s \in S, s \neq s^*$ such that s dominates s^* with respect to $\prec_{B_\epsilon}$ i.e.*

$$s \prec_{B_\epsilon} s^*.$$

We may consider relation $\prec_{B_\epsilon}$ as a candidate for generative relation of the ϵ-Berge-Zhukovskii equilibrium. What we need to prove is that the set of the non-dominated strategies with respect to the relation $\prec_{B_\epsilon}$ equals the set of ϵ-Berge-Zhukovskii equilibria of the game. In this case, $\prec_{B_\epsilon}$ could be used to compare strategy profiles and guide the search of heuristics such as evolutionary algorithms towards the ϵ-BZ equilibria.

Proposition 1. *If a strategy profile $s^* \in S$ is an ϵ- Berge-Zhukovskii equilibrium then the inequality*

$$b_\epsilon(s^*, s) = 0$$

holds, for all $s \in S$.

Proof 1. *Let $s^* \in BZ_\epsilon$. Suppose there exists a strategy profile $s \in S$, such that $b_\epsilon(s^*, s) = w$, $w > 0$. Therefore there exists $i \in N$, such that*

$$u_i(s^*, s_{-i}) + \epsilon > u_i(s^*).$$

This contradicts the definition of the ϵ- Berge-Zhukovskii equilibrium. Hence $b_\epsilon(s^*, s) = 0$.

Proposition 2. *All ϵ-BE equilibrium strategies are ϵ-Berge-Zhukovskii non-dominated strategies, i.e.*

$$BZ_\epsilon \subseteq BZN_\epsilon.$$

Proof 2. *Let $s^* \in BZ_\epsilon$. Suppose s^* is dominated. Therefore there exists a strategy profile $s \in S$ dominating s^*:*

$$s \prec_{B_\epsilon} s^*.$$

From definition of the relation $\prec_{B_\epsilon}$ we have

$$b_\epsilon(s, s^*) < b_\epsilon(s^*, s).$$

As s^* is an ϵ-Berge-Zhukovskii equilibrium from Prop. 1 it follows that

$$b_\epsilon(s^*, s) = 0.$$

Thus we have

$$b_\epsilon(s, s^*) < 0.$$

But this is not possible, because $b_\epsilon(s, s^*)$ denotes the cardinality of a set. Therefore s^* is from BZN_ϵ (i.e. non-dominated).

Proposition 3. *All ϵ-Berge-Zhukovskii non-dominated strategies are ϵ-BZ equilibrium strategies, i.e.*

$$BZN_\epsilon \subseteq BZ_\epsilon.$$

Proof 3. *Let us consider $s^* \in BZN$ (s^* is a non-dominated strategy profile) and suppose that $s^* \notin BZ$.*

If $s^* \notin BZ \Rightarrow \exists s_{-i}$ such that

$$u_i(s^*) < u_i(s^*, s_{-i}) + \epsilon, \tag{1}$$

and $s^*_{-i} \nexists s_{-i}$.

Let us denote by q the strategy profile (s^*, s_{-i}).

We have:

$$b_\epsilon(s^*, q) = card\{j \in N, u_j(s^*) < u_j(s^*_j, q_{-j}) + \epsilon, s^*_{-j} \nexists q_{-j}\}.$$

But for all $j \neq i$ we have $s^*_i = q_i$ so $s^*_{-j} \nexists q_{-j}$ does not hold, and for $j = i$ relation (1) holds, therefore $b_\epsilon(s^*, q) = 1$.

On the other hand

$$b_\epsilon(q, s^*) = card\{j \in N, u_j(q) < u_j(q_j, s^*_{-j}) + \epsilon, q_{-j} \nexists s^*_{-j}\}.$$

If $i \neq j$ $s^*_i = q_i$ so $q_{-j} \nexists s^*_{-j}$ does not hold.

If $i = j$ we have $(q_i, s^*_{-i}) = s^*$, therefore $u_i(q) < u_i(q_i, s^*_{-i})$, if and only if

$$u_i(q) < u_i(s^*) + \epsilon$$

if

$$u_i(s^*, s_{-i}) < u_i(s^*) + \epsilon$$

which would contradict relation (1). Therefore $b_\epsilon(q, s^*) = 0$.

We have that $b_\epsilon(s^*, q) > b_\epsilon(q, s^*)$, which contradicts the assumption of non-domination, therefore s^* is an ϵ-BZ equilibrium.

Proposition 4. *All ϵ-Berge-Zhukovskii equilibria are ϵ-Berge-Zhukovskii non-dominated strategies and all ϵ-Berge-Zhukovskii non-dominated strategies are ϵ-Berge-Zhukovskii equilibria:*

$$BZ_\epsilon = BNS_\epsilon.$$

Proof 4. *Directly from Proposition 2 and Proposition 3.*

4. Evolutionary detection method

Solving a multiplayer game in which players seek to maximize their payoffs has many common features with the Multiobjective Optimization Problem (MOP). In both cases the goal is to maximize the payoffs/objective functions.

For a MOP the m objectives are represented by a set $\{u_i\}_{i\in\{1,...,m\}}$ of functions where $u_i : S \to \mathbb{R}$ maps a solution s from the decision space $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ to the objective space $\mathbb{R}$. $F : S \to \mathbb{R}^m$ represents the objective vector that needs to be maximized $F(s) = (u_1(s), u_2(s), ..., u_m(s))$.

Usually the ideal solution vector s that optimizes simultaneously all objective functions does not exist. When solving a multiobjective problem usually one does not find a single solution that best approximate F but a set of solutions that approximate the *Pareto optimal set*. The Pareto optimal set is formed by the *Pareto non-dominated* solutions which represent the best trade-offs among the m objectives. Thus two solutions are compared using the Pareto dominance relation: for any two decision vectors $s, s' \in S$ we say that s is better than s' or s *dominates* s', if $u_i(s) \geq u_i(s')\forall i \in \{1, ..., m\}$ and $\exists j \in \{1, ..., m\}$ such that $u_j(s) > u_j(s')$.

Evolutionary Multiobjective Algorithms have been successfully used for solving such problems [5], [23]. As they are population based metaheuristics they represent a good choice because by evolving a set of possible solutions (the population) a good approximation of the Pareto front can be found in a single run while the shape, continuity or other mathematical properties of the true front do not hinder the search.

The task of the optimization algorithm is to find a good approximation of the Pareto optimal set while maintaining a good diversity in the population. In Pareto based multiobjective optimization algorithms the search is driven by the Pareto dominance relation: if a new generated solution Pareto dominates a solution from the current population it replaces it in the next population.

For detecting the ϵ-Berge-Zhukovskii equilibrium any Pareto based multiobjective algorithm is suitable. The only modification needed is the replacement of the Pareto dominance relation whenever it is used during the search with the relation $\prec_{B_\epsilon}$.

5. Numerical experiments

The computation of ϵ-Berge-Zhukovskii equilibria is illustrated for two examples of games with two and three players. These games correspond to

a multiple objective optimization problem where the problem objectives are represented by the payoff of each player but searching for a different *solution concept*.

For detecting ϵ -Berge-Zhukovskii equilibria a modified version of the Nondominated Sorting Genetic Algorithm II (*NSGA-II*) [9] algorithm is considered. *NSGA-II* is an evolutionary multiobjective optimization algorithm based on the Pareto dominance. The *NSGA-II* algorithm is modified by replacing the Pareto dominance procedure with the generative relation $\prec_{B_\epsilon}$. A new version of the *NSGA-II* method for ϵ-Berge-Zhukovskii equilibrium detection called *BZ-NSGA-II* is obtained.

For all the tests a population of 150 individuals is used for 150 generations of the *BZ-NSGA-II*. As for the variation operators we use a distribution indexes for mutation and crossover $\eta_m = 20$ and $\eta_c = 20$.

The obtained results are illustrated in the following manner: for two or three players the payoffs space is represented by assigning axes to the payoff of each player and representing solutions as points in the two and three dimensional spaces respectively. In each graphic the set of ϵ-BZ is represented with gray color.

5.1. Experiment 1

Let us consider the two-person continuous game G_1 [21], having the following payoff functions:

$$\begin{aligned} &u_1(s_1, s_2) = -s_1^2 - s_1 + s_2, \\ &u_2(s_1, s_2) = 2s_1^2 + 3s_1 - s_2^2 - 3s_2, \\ &s_i \in [-2, 1], i = 1, 2. \end{aligned}$$

The Berge-Zhukovskii equilibrium of the game is $(1, 1)$ with the corresponding payoffs $(-1, 1)$. Figures 1-4 present the detected ϵ-Berge-Zhukovskii equilibria for $\epsilon \in \{0, 0.1, 0.2, 0.5, 0.9\}$.

5.2. Experiment 2 - Voluntary contribution mechanism

The Voluntary Contribution Mechanism (*VCM*) is a good example illustrating that people are not totally self-interested. They spend time making something for the common good. Theoretical studies [4] and experiments [11, 16] are made concerning player behavior. A model of the *VCM* is described as game G_2:

$$u_i(s) = 10 - s_i + 0.4 \sum_{i=1,n} s_i, s_i \in [0, 10], i = 1, ..., n.$$



Figure 1: G_1, $\epsilon = 0.1$. Theoretical ϵ-BZ are represented in gray. Detected solutions cover the theoretical front efficiently



Figure 2: G_1, $\epsilon = 0.2$. Increasing the value of ϵ leads to a larger set of ϵ-BZ which is covered by the detected solutions.



Figure 3: G_1, $\epsilon = 0.5$. Increasing ϵ enlarges the set of equilibria, but it is still well covered by detected solutions.



Figure 4: G_1, $\epsilon = 0.9$. Even for $\epsilon = 0.9$ $BZ - NSGA - II$ is capable to compute a reasonable set of ϵ-BZ solutions.

In this game the Berge-Zhukovskii equilibrium is achieved when all players play strategy 10, which means they spend all for the public good. Detected ϵ-Berge-Zhukovskii equilibria for the two-player version of the *VCM* game are presented in Figures 5, 6, 7 and 8. Results obtained for the three player version of the game are depicted in Figures 9, 10, 11 and 12.

Discussion. Numerical experiments presented here illustrates that *BZ-NSGA-II* technique is able to find a good approximation of the ϵ-Berge-Zhukovskii set for different values of ϵ and for different number of players.

As it is natural to expect, by increasing the value of ϵ the number of ϵ-Berge-Zhukovskii equilibria also increases by covering a region (whose shape depends on the payoff function) in the payoffs space that includes the Berge-



Figure 5: Voluntary Contribution Mechanism, evolutionary detected solutions for $\epsilon = 0.1$.



Figure 6: Voluntary Contribution Mechanism, evolutionary detected solutions for $\epsilon = 0.2$.



Figure 7: Voluntary Contribution Mechanism, evolutionary detected solutions for $\epsilon = 0.5$.



Figure 8: Voluntary Contribution Mechanism, evolutionary detected solutions for $\epsilon = 0.9$.

Zhukovskii equilibrium. In fact, for $\epsilon = 0$ the Berge-Zhukovskii equilibrium is obtained.

6. Conclusion

Berge-Zhukovskii equilibrium is a powerful concept specially in trust games. The ϵ-Berge-Zhukovskii equilibrium represents a flexible concept that approximates the BZ equilibrium. It may be also considered as a relaxation of the BZ equilibrium. The ϵ-Berge-Zhukovskii equilibrium is introduced in this paper. A generative relation characterizing the set of ϵ-Berge-Zhukovskii equilibria is also proposed.



Figure 9: Voluntary Contribution Mechanism and evolutionary detected solutions for $\epsilon = 0.1$.



Figure 10: Voluntary Contribution Mechanism and evolutionary detected solutions for $\epsilon = 0.2$.



Figure 11: Voluntary Contribution Mechanism and evolutionary detected solutions for $\epsilon = 0.5$.



Figure 12: Voluntary Contribution Mechanism and evolutionary detected solutions for $\epsilon = 0.9$.

Apart defining the equilibrium concept, a computational method to approach these equilibria is presented. Based on the idea that the equilibrium search and the multi-objective optimization can be considered in the same class of problems, an evolutionary algorithm for multiobjective optimization is adapted for ϵ-Berge-Zhukovskii equilibria detection. Numerical experiments validate the proposed method and confirm the theoretical results presented.

7. Acknowledgments

This project was supported by the national project code TE 252 financed by the Romanian Ministry of Education and Research CNCSIS-UEFISCSU.

The first author wishes to thank to the "Collegium Talentum". The authors would also like to acknowledge the support received within the OPEN-RES Academic Writing project 212/2012.

References

[1] Kokou Abalo and Michael Kostreva. Berge equilibrium: some recent results from fixed-point theorems. *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 169:624–638, 2005.

[2] Kokou Y. Abalo and Michael M. Kostreva. Intersection theorems and their applications to berge equilibria. *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 182(2):1840 – 1848, 2006.

[3] Claude Berge. *Theorie generale des jeux a n personnes*. Gauthier-Villars, 1957.

[4] Olivier Bochet, Talbot Page, and Louis Putterman. Communication and punishment in voluntary contribution experiments. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 60(1):11–26, 2006.

[5] Carlos A. Coello Coello, Gary B. Lamont, and David A. Van Veldhuizen. *Evolutionary Algorithms for Solving Multi-Objective Problems (Genetic and Evolutionary Computation)*. Springer, 2007.

[6] Andrew M. Colman, Tom W. Korner, Olivier Musy, and Tarik Tazdait. Mutual support in games: Some properties of Berge equilibria. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 55(2):166 – 175, 2011.

[7] Pierre Courtois, Rabia Nessah, and Tarik Tazdait. How to play the games? nash versus berge behavior rules. Working Papers 11-05, LAMETA, Universtiy of Montpellier, February 2011.

[8] Paula Curt, Cristian Litan, and Diana Filip. The least core in fixed-income taxation models: a brief mathematical inspection. *Journal of Inequalities and Applications*, 2011(1):138, 2011.

[9] Kalyanmoy Deb, Samir Agrawal, Amrit Pratap, and T. Meyarivan. A fast and elitist multiobjective genetic algorithm: NSGA-II. *IEEE Trans. Evolutionary Computation*, 6(2):182–197, 2002.

[10] D. Dumitrescu, Rodica Ioana Lung, and Tudor Dan Mihoc. Generative relations for evolutionary equilibria detection. In *Proceedings of the 11th Annual conference on Genetic and evolutionary computation*, 2009.

[11] Urs Fischbacher, Simon Gachter, and Ernst Fehr. Are people conditionally cooperative? evidence from a public goods experiment. *Economics Letters*, 71(3):397 – 404, 2001.

[12] Noémi Gaskó, D. Dumitrescu, and Rodica Ioana Lung. Evolutionary detection of Berge and Nash equilibria. In David Pelta, Natalio Krasnogor, Dan Dumitrescu, Camelia Chira, and Rodica Lung, editors, *Nature Inspired Cooperative Strategies for Optimization (NICSO 2011)*, volume 387 of *Studies in Computational Intelligence*, pages 149–158. Springer Berlin / Heidelberg, 2012.

[13] Saku Kukkonen and Jouni Lampinen. GDE3: the third evolution step of generalized differential evolution. In *Congress on Evolutionary Computation*, pages 443–450, 2005.

[14] Moussa Larbani and Rabia Nessah. A note on the existence of Berge and Berge?-Nash equilibria. *Mathematical Social Sciences*, 55:258–271, 2008.

[15] Rodica Ioana Lung and D. Dumitrescu. Computing Nash equilibria by means of evolutionary computation. *Int. J. of Computers, Communications & Control*, 3:364–368, 2008.

[16] Laurent Muller, Martin Sefton, Richard Steinberg, and Lise Vesterlund. Strategic behavior and learning in repeated voluntary contribution experiments. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 67(3-4):782–793, 2008.

[17] RyanO. Murphy, Amnon Rapoport, and JamesE. Parco. The breakdown of cooperation in iterative real-time trust dilemmas. *Experimental Economics*, 9(2):147–166, 2006.

[18] Olivier Musy, Antonin Pottier, and Tarik Tazdait. A new theorem to find berge equilibria. *International Game Theory Review (IGTR)*, 14(01):1250005–1–1, 2012.

[19] John Nash. Non-Cooperative Games. *The Annals of Mathematics*, 54(2):286–295, 1951.

[20] Rabia Nessah, Moussa Larbani, and Tarik Tazdait. A note on Berge equilibrium. *Applied Mathematics Letters*, 20(8):926 – 932, 2007.

[21] Rabia Nessah and Guoqiang Tian. On the existence of Strong Nash equilibria. Technical report, IESEG School of Management, 2009.

[22] Roy Radner. Collusive behavior in noncooperative epsilon-equilibria of oligopolies with long but finite lives. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 22:136–154, 1980.

[23] Aimin Zhou, Bo-Yang Qu, Hui Li, Shi-Zheng Zhao, Ponnuthurai Nagaratnam Suganthan, and Qingfu Zhang. Multiobjective evolutionary algorithms: A survey of the state of the art. *Swarm and Evolutionary Computation*, 1(1):32 – 49, 2011.

[24] V. I. Zhukovskii and Arkadii A. Chikrii. Linear-quadratic differential games. In *Naukova Dumka, Kiev*, 1994.